

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **December 31, 2003**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-55. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1 August 2000, paper number 4, is missing from the application file wrapper. The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(4) and 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5). The specification was objected to because of the term JAVA™ was not properly identified as a trademark. Claims 1-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 11-13, 17-19, 23, 25-26, 28-30, 34-36, 40, 42-43, 45-47, 51-53, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Klug et al. (USPN 5,790,785, hereinafter “Klug”). Claims 3-5, 20-22, 37-39, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug. Claims 7, 15, 241, 32, 41, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug in view of Jacobs et al. (USPN 5,611,048, hereinafter “Jacobs”). Claims 10, 14, 16, 27, 31, 33, 44, 48, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug in view of Jones et al. (USPN 5,623,637, hereinafter “Jones”).

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1 August 2000, paper number 4, is missing from the application file wrapper.

Applicant has no record of submitting an Information Disclosure Statement on 1 August 2000.

Objections to the drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(4) and 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5).

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the typographical errors and omissions concerning reference numbers. The drawings are correct as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the specification

The specification was objected to because of the term JAVA™ was not properly identified as a trademark.

Applicant has amended the specification to properly identify the term JAVA™ as a trademark. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the phrase “the plurality of applications” does not have sufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully points out that each of claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 includes “a plurality of applications” in the preamble.

Claims 10, 27, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the phrase “can include” is indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 10, 27, and 44 to change the phrase “can include” to “includes one of.”

Claims 3-5, 20-22, 37-39, and 54 provide for the use of JAVA™ applets but does not clearly define JAVA™ or identify it as a trademark.

Applicant has amended claims 3-5, 20-22, 37-39, and 54 to change the references to “JAVA™” to the generic term “platform-independent.” These amendments find support on page 8, lines 13-17 of the instant application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 were rejected as being anticipated by Klug. Additionally, dependent claims 7, 24, and 41 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klug in view of Jacobs. Applicant respectfully points out that Klug teaches a registration system for supplying registration information, possibly including a common user ID and password, to different websites to ease the process of registering with the website (see Klug, col.6, line 37 to col. 7, line 60). Applicant also respectfully points out that Jacobs teaches using a node ID in the process of changing a password (see Jacobs, FIG. 8 and col. 9, line 66 to page 10, line 28). Jacobs does not, however, teach authenticating the node ID. Note that authenticating the node ID typically involves some form of cryptographic process.

In contrast, the present invention includes a password store that includes a plurality of passwords so that a user can access multiple applications, each with a **different password** (see page 11, lines 14-18 of the instant application). The present invention also authenticates the remote computer system (node) to ensure that the remote computer system is authorized to download the applet (see page 11, lines 4-8 of the instant application). There is nothing in the teachings of Klug and Jacobs, either separately or in concert, which suggests authenticating the remote computer system. Furthermore, there is no combination of Klug and Jacobs that teaches storing multiple passwords so that a different password can be used with each application.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 to clarify that the present invention includes a plurality of passwords so that a user can access multiple applications, each with a separate user ID and password. These amendments find support on page 11, lines 14-18 of the instant application. Applicant has also amended independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 to include the limitations from claims 7, 24, and 41 to clarify that the present invention authenticates the remote computer system to ensure that the remote computer system is authorized to download the applet. These amendments find support in claims 7, 24, and 41 and on page 11, lines 4-8 of the instant application. Claims 7, 24, and 41 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, and 55 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6 and 8-17, which depend upon claim 1, claims 19-23 and 25-34, which depend upon claim 18, claims 36-40 and 42-51, which depend upon claim 35, and claims 53-54 which depend upon claim 52, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: September 29, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665